

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 47 has been amended, and claim 48 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 was previously canceled, and claims 2, 5-7, 9-12, and 14-46 were previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 13, and 47 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 4 and 47 are independent claims. Claims 3, 4, 8, and 13 are allowed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 6(A) & (B) and 13(A) & (B), as well as paragraphs [0076-0078, 0104, and 0149] of the specification.

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because it (a) places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration by the Examiner because similar subject matter was previously considered by the Examiner and thus further consideration and/or search by the Examiner is not warranted; and (c) responds to formal matters set forth by the Examiner. For at least these reasons, entry of the present Amendment is therefore respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 3, 4, 8, and 13 are allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claim 47 has been amended for clarification. This amendment is made for the sole purpose of clarifying claim 47. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 47, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 47.

Claim 47

Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0079944 applied for by Hiroshima, *et al.* ("Hiroshima") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,614,733 issued to Zhang, *et al.* ("Zhang"). Claim 47 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hiroshima in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,829 issued to Miyanaga, *et al.* ("Miyanaga").

A prima facie case of obviousness is established only if three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

Here, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness at least because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings because Hiroshima teaches away from the combination. The Office Action states that "Hiroshima does not disclose the specific limitations regarding the average number of grain boundaries in the channel regions of the switching and driving TFTs." Page 5, lines 21-

23; page 6, lines 15-17. Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, Hiroshima states that "... crystal grain boundaries are prevented from being included in each channel formation region" (Abstract) and that "hence it is possible to form a channel formation region with a large effective channel width, while avoiding the inclusion of crystal grain boundaries in the channel formation region." (paragraph [0011], lines 6-9; see also paragraph [0066], lines 4-7). Accordingly, Hiroshima teaches thin film transistor channel regions without crystal grain boundaries. Yet, the Office Action suggests it would have been obvious to combine Hiroshima with Zhang and Hiroshima with Miyanaga to teach driving and switching thin film transistors with grain boundaries in an active channel region. Thus, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Hiroshima in the manner suggested by the Office Action because "[i]t is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination." MPEP § 2145.X.D.2.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that even if a reference taught an organic electroluminescent device having switching and driving thin film transistors without the explicit teachings of Hiroshima noted above, there still would be no suggestion or motivation to modify such a reference in the manner the Office Action suggests. Both Zhang and Miyanaga teach liquid crystal displays with a single thin film transistor per pixel. A person of ordinary skill in the art of organic electroluminescent devices would not consult a reference discussing differences in thin film transistors in a liquid crystal display, particularly when those thin film transistors are located in different areas of the liquid crystal display, to teach characteristics of switching and driving thin film transistors in a single pixel of an organic device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claim 47. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 47 is allowable.

Claim 48

Claim 48 has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 48 moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 4, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP:BYC/alj